

vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate, and if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Silvers nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Texas.

#### INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT—Continued

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the mammoth \$1.2 trillion infrastructure bill before the Senate.

On Sunday night, we finally got to see the 2,700-page infrastructure bill that we will be voting on sometime tomorrow or Saturday. And what we saw is that Democrats want to give billions of dollars to unelected bureaucrats in the Biden administration to spend however they please.

This bill spends \$21.5 billion to create a new office at the Department of Energy called the Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations, which would give President Biden's Secretary of Energy the power to use taxpayer dollars to invest in whatever green energy initiative she likes. Reminiscent of Solyndra, we can have the same bankruptcies at taxpayer expense.

This bill spends \$24 billion in taxpayer dollars to preserve the water in the San Francisco Bay, and the Long Island Sound would receive \$106 million in taxpayer dollars.

As the New York Times reported, "Climate resiliency programs would receive their largest burst of government spending ever" from this bill.

And the Wall Street Journal rightly called it "a major down payment on President Biden's Green New Deal." That is exactly what this bill is.

Furthermore, this bill institutes a new tax on 42 chemicals that will raise prices for everyday consumers. Texans will bear the brunt of these high prices because 40 percent of the manufacturing plants that this new tax will hit are in Texas alone.

But this tax will also hurt Louisiana and Michigan and Pennsylvania and Ohio and other manufacturing States.

Indeed, this provision will also likely make many of the raw materials used

in infrastructure projects more expensive.

I filed an amendment that would strike this harmful provision. Not only will manufacturing plants in Texas be hurt by this new tax, but for some of these plants, the new taxes will exceed profit margins, leading to plant closings and more and more manufacturing moving to China.

In effect, the loss of these plants would result in lower tax revenue to the Federal Government, not more. Imports would rise, U.S. exports would fall, and production in the United States would fall as well.

Ironically, this infrastructure bill also tries to grow more critical minerals manufacturing and personal protective equipment, or PPE, manufacturing in America. But it places a brandnew tax on both of these things.

PPE is made with many of the 42 chemicals this infrastructure bill now wants to tax, and four of these chemicals are on the Biden administration's own critical minerals list.

The old saying was: If it moves, tax it, and if it stops moving, subsidize it. Well, this bill taxes the things that we are trying to get moving in the first place.

This bill is also a liberal spending wish list. The fact of the matter is, this bill spends too much money, and it is not paid for. We are told that this bill would, in part, be paid for with \$205 billion in repurposed COVID relief funds. But when the bill text was released, magically, those funds weren't there. It became apparent, instead, that only about \$50 billion in COVID funds was being used to help pay for this bill.

Some have claimed that the bill is paid for, but, by any measure, the pay-fors are quite simply gimmicks. This is a bait-and-switch, and the bill is not paid for like we were promised.

At a time when we spent trillions of dollars already to combat a deadly pandemic, at a time when we are seeing rising inflation across the country, we can't responsibly be spending yet another trillion dollars. This bill is part of a much broader problem we are having with reckless Federal spending.

Furthermore, suppose this so-called bipartisan \$1.2 trillion infrastructure bill were being offered in exchange for the Democrats' massive \$3.5 trillion reckless tax-and-spend bill. In that case, I could understand the logic of doing the smaller bill instead of the massive bill. But it is not being offered in exchange.

The Democrats have made it clear that they are going to pass this infrastructure bill, take every penny of the spending, and then turn around and try to ram through their massive \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spend bill right on top of this, which means we are looking at about \$5 trillion of spending in just those two bills.

That means trillions of dollars in new taxes. If you pay taxes, they are going up. It means corporate taxes are going up; it means individual taxes are

going up; it means small business taxes are going up; it means capital gains taxes are going up; it means the death tax is going up—all while our debt is going through the roof and inflation is rising across the country.

Republicans shouldn't play a part in this. We should instead say enough is enough.

Look, the American people want good roads and good bridges. I want good roads and good bridges. But what this bill does is reminds me of the old swindler who says over and over again: I am going to sell you a bridge; I am going to sell you the Brooklyn Bridge—because the proponents of this bill are selling the same bridge over and over and over again. They go on TV, and they say: Bridges are popular. Roads are popular. You want roads and bridges; therefore, we have to do this.

So let's see what the actual spending looks like to understand the shell game that is being played.

This bill has about \$100 billion for roads and bridges. Do you know what? If the Democrats want to pass just that—\$100 billion for roads and bridges—I bet you could we get 90 Senators to agree with that. We could be done and go home this evening.

And let me remind my fellow Senators: \$100 billion is a lot of money. We aren't talking about \$5 at a soda machine in the hall. We aren't talking about \$100. We are talking about \$100 billion, which, in history, is massive spending. But compare that to the \$1.2 trillion in this bill. It is not Monopoly money. It is not make-believe money. It is taxpayer dollars, and it is money we are borrowing from China and debt that we are putting on our kids and grandkids.

The roads and bridges part of this bill, in the context of the larger spending free-for-all in Washington, is about one-eighty-sixth the explosive spending going on. Let's compare that to the overall spending going on in this bill and the total spending, so that it is not in a silo or a vacuum; it is all together.

The \$1.2 trillion infrastructure bill today is roughly 12 times the new spending on roads and bridges. So they are selling the roads and bridges, but the bill is 12 times bigger. But that ain't it. A few months ago, the Democrats rammed through a massive, so-called COVID relief bill. Only 9 percent of the bill actually went to healthcare spending for COVID.

That was \$1.9 trillion. So that was roughly 19 times larger than what is being spent on roads and bridges. Mind you, we keep being told: Roads and bridges are good.

That bill was 19 times that.

And then the massive \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spend bill that is coming right after this that the Democrats intend to ram through—that is 35 times the spending on roads and bridges. And when you add up the spending from December 2020 to now, with the Biden budget request, with the Democrats' tax-and-spend reconciliation proposal,